N°5

Christus Deus.

THE

DIVINITY

OF

Our Saviour

Asserted and Vindicated, from the Exceptions of the *Socinians* and others.

In a SERMON preached at St. *Peter's Hungate*, in *Norwich*, upon the Festival of St. *Philip* and St. *James*, in the Year 1673.

By *BERNARD SKELTON*,

Sometime Vicar of *Hinton*,

ejected at the Revolution

LONDON,

Printed for *Jonathan Robinson* at the Golden Lion in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, and *Samuel Oliver* Bookseller in *Norwich*. MDCXCII.

THE BOOKSELLER TO THE READER.

THIS Diſcourſe was long ago ſuppreſs'd by the Author, after it had been ſent to the Preſs, and the Copy was loſt. But a Gentleman who lived with the Tranſcriber, retriev'd a Copy, and has, at his own Charge and Trouble, expoſed it to the World; the Author neither correcting nor reviewing it: ſo that whatever Errata's you meet with, all muſt not be laid upon him. This I remember he told me, that if he had put it out himſelf, he would have cut off a great many extravagant Enlargements, (ſo he termed them) which though they paſſed in the Pulpit, could not but be irkſom to an intelligent Reader, who expects not Words, but Reaſon.

B.R.

THE
Divinity of our Saviour
Aſſerted and Vindicated, from the Exceptions of the *Socinians* and others.

JOHN 14. part of the 9th Verſe,
He that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father.

ST. *Peter* himſelf was not more eminent in the Church of God, than he whoſe Feſtivals we this day celebrate. If *Cephas* was a Pillar, ſo was *James* alſo: And in that pure and primitive Council, mentioned, *Acts* 15. he is ſo far from coming ſhort of St. *Peter* in Place and Dignity, that the general Vogue will here give him the Priority: For after he had heard the Opinion of the whole Council, he, as chief of this Divine Convocation, briefly rehearſeth their ſeveral Opinions, and laſtly gives his definitive and determinative Sentence, *That we trouble not them, who from among the Gentiles are turned to God.* And though *Rome* hath raiſed her proud Hills above the Clouds, and ſtretched forth her Neck beyond her Siſter-Churches; yet we know that *Jeruſalem* was the Mother of us all: There the Goſpel was firſt planted; from thence it was diſperſed through the World: and

St. *James* was the first Bishop thereof, if we may believe *Baronius*. And why then may not St. *James*'s Successors challenge Supremacy, as well as St. *Peter*'s, since *Jerusalem* was the Mother-Church? But if St. *Peter*'s Confession gave him this Prerogative, St. *Philip* will step in here, and say, he made it before him: for in *John* 1. 45. he tells *Nathanael*, *We have found him of whom* Moses *in the Law and the Prophets did write*: Which is nothing else but a Periphrasis of the Messiah, and is so interpreted by *Nathanael* also, *ver.* 49. *Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of* Israel.

But not to make the Apostles contend or justle for Superiority, since they had learn'd of their Master, *that he that would be greatest, must be their Minister*, and *he that would be chiefest, must be Servant to all*; it is most certain that these our Apostles were in the number of those Stones which were the Foundation of the New and Heavenly *Jerusalem*, the City of God. Neither in their way were they inferiour to any in the Work of the Ministry, and the promoting the Interest of the Gospel: For St. *James* residing at *Jerusalem*, hath, as well as St. *Paul*, the care of all the Churches, and by his Catholick Epistle, confounds Heresy, confirms the Brethren, advanceth the miraculous Power of Prayer, particularly that by the Elders of the Church; confutes the *Solifidians*; proves that Faith without Works, is no better than the Faith of Devils, which believe and tremble; that without Works it is dead. And the Doctrine thereof hath been long since buried, till of late Years it revived, and gained a Resurrection at *Geneva*.

St. *Philip* preached the Gospel in *Scythia*, and found more Humanity among those Barbarians, than with those that stiled themselves Christians: For after twenty

ty Years Travel in that large and barbarous Country, where, contrary to expectation, both himself and Doctrine found a most welcome Reception, (so easily can the meek Temper of the Gospel triumph over salvage Natures, and Giant-like Spirits) he returned to *Hierapolis*, a City of *Syria*, where he encounters and confutes the *Ebonites*, those συμμαχοι, who denied the Divinity of our Saviour; and there, say some, he found a Tomb, others a Martyrdom. So early had Hereticks learn'd, as well as Jews, to overwhelm with Stones, whom they could not gainsay by Scripture. If we look into the Gospel, we shall find him, as soon as he was made an Apostle, making others Disciples, bringing *Nathanael*, the true Israelite, to the King of *Israel*; obliging the very Gentiles, making Greeks do Homage to the King of the Jews; and here in this Gospel, whereof my Text is a part, earnestly intreating to be instructed in that Doctrine, for which he was content to die.

Shew us, saith he, *the Father, and it sufficeth.* And Jesus saith unto him, *Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me*, Philip? *He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father.*

I shall not trouble you with any subtile and accurate Division of the Words; but from this great Truth here asserted by our Saviour, I shall raise this one Observation or Doctrine, which is the natural Consequence of the Words, *That Christ is one in Essence with the Father*; he is the most High God, the God of *Israel*. For if this be true which our Saviour asserts, that *whosoever seeth him, seeth the Father*; and who dare doubt it, since it's Truth it self that speaks it; we must rationally conclude, either that he is the Father, which is denied by all, or else that the Father and he have one and

the ſame Divine Eſſence. For whether we make uſe of rational, ſpiritual or corporal Opticks; whether this Viſion be made by the Eye of the Underſtanding, and we interpret the Words, *He that knows me, knows the Father*; or elſe by the Eye of Faith, and ſo, *He that believes in me, believes in the Father*; or we take the Words properly, and by ſeeing is meant the Action of our corporal and ſenſitive Organ; the reſult will be the ſame, the Conſequence not different. For if it be true, that whoſoever knows or believes Chriſt, knows the Father, the Conſequence will be, what our Saviour aſſerts, *John* 10. 30. *That he and the Father are one.*

But to theſe object *Socinus* and the Racovian Catechiſm, firſt, That theſe Words can by no means be applied to the Divine Eſſence, which, ſay we as well as they, is inviſible and inacceſſible to the moſt piercing Eye of poor Mortality, ſince the Angels themſelves are forc'd to vail their Faces. But this is ſo ſenſleſs a ſhift, that they muſt be blind indeed, who cannot ſee how to anſwer it: For who ever was ſo quick-ſighted yet, as to ſpy the Eſſences of Things? *Eſſentia rerum non incurrunt in ſenſus.* Who ever look'd upon a Man, and ſpied his Soul, that Bird of Paradiſe, perking upon a little Glandule in the midſt of the Brain, and from thence giving its imperious Dictates to every Member of the Body? Or elſe, what Tube or Spectacles did he uſe, to ſee the Soul diffuſed through the whole, and be wholly in the whole, and yet wholly in every part thereof? Now though when we look on a Man, we cannot ſee his Eſſence, and yet by his Diſcourſe and Reaſon, we ſee and know he hath the Eſſence of a Man: ſo whoſoever looks on Chriſt, though the Divine Eſſence be inviſible; yet ſince he that ſees him, ſees the Father, muſt neceſſarily acknowledg, that he

hath

hath the Eſſence of the Father, he is one with the Father, he is the moſt High God, the God of *Iſrael*.

But ſay the Objectors, If this be granted, yet the Conſequence you make is altogether illogical; for if it be true, that he who ſees Chriſt, ſees the Father, it naturally follows, that Chriſt is the Father, and not, as you ſay, that he is one in Eſſence with the Father. And ſo, contrary to your own Principles, you confound the Perſons, and make the Son the Father, and the Father the Son, which is a Contradiction, and altogether impoſſible.

To this I anſwer, that the word *Father* in the Scripture is taken either eſſentially and abſolutely for God, or the Divine Nature; or elſe perſonally and reſpectively in reference to the other Perſons of the ſacred Trinity. An Example of the latter we have in the Commiſſion of Baptiſm; *Go, and diſciple all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt.* And again, *There are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt.* And an Example of the former we have in thoſe Words of the Jews, *We have one Father, even God:* And of the Prophet *Iſaiah*, chap. 9. 6. *His Name ſhall be called Wonderful, Counſellor, The mighty God, The Everlaſting Father.* Now either the Prophet meant he ſhould be called as he was to be, and then the Everlaſting Father muſt ſignify eſſentially the Eternal God; or elſe he ſhould not be what he foretold he ſhould be called: And ſo there is here no Prerogative of the Meſſiah foretold, but the Prophecy is a mere Scoff, and an ironical Mock of him who was to be the Deſire of all Nations. And the meaning is, he ſhould be called the wonderful Counſellor, but he ſhall be only one of no Parts, no Wit, Counſel or Advice: He ſhall be called

The

The mighty God, but ſhall be only ψιλὸς ἄνθρωπος, a poor, weak, ſilly Man: He ſhall be called, *The Everlaſting Father*, but ſhall be the moſt deſpicable amongſt the Sons of Men. Now ſince this Interpretation is contrary to the Scope of the Prophet, and the Tenour of the whole Scripture, and it's a Contradiction that in one and the ſame Reſpect the Father ſhould be the Son, and the Son ſhould be the Father; we muſt conclude that the word *Father* in this Prophecy muſt be taken eſſentially for God, or the Divine Nature. And if here and in ſeveral other Places of Scripture, (which my time will not now give me leave to enumerate) the word *Father* is ſo taken, why not in this Speech of our Saviour's? which will make the Senſe clear and obvious to the meaneſt Underſtanding, *He that ſeeth me, ſeeth the Father*, that is, ſeeth God, him who hath the Divine Nature; or elſe, which amounts to the ſame, is one in Eſſence with the Father.

There is yet an Interpretation more, which is the learned *Hammond*'s, in his Paraphraſe on the New Teſtament, where he ſaith, The Son is ſaid to be the Image of his Father, and *whoſoever ſeeth the Son, ſeeth the Father*, alluding to the Expreſſion of the Apoſtle, where Chriſt is ſaid to be *the Brightneſs of his Father's Glory, the expreſs Image of his Perſon*. But this is ſo far from helping our Adverſaries, that indeed it doth both confute and confound them: For though, as they ſay truly, the Image, and that it repreſents, cannot be the ſame; yet the Son cannot be ſaid to be the Image of his Perſon, without he have one and the ſame Divine Nature and Eſſence: For every Image either expreſſeth the outward Lineaments and Proportions of the thing it repreſents, as a Picture, Statue and Impreſſion; or elſe together with the outward Lineaments, the

the Geſture and Motion of the thing it repreſents, as a Mirrour or Looking-glaſs. Thus Man as he was created in Holineſs, and had Power given him over the Creatures, did repreſent, or was the Image of God in the Imitation of the Divine Operations, or in the Exerciſe of his Power, Juſtice and Mercy: or elſe it expreſſeth the Nature, Genius, Perſon, and internal Form of that whereof it is the Image. Thus the Son of Man cannot be the natural Image of his Father, unleſs he hath one and the ſame ſpecifical Nature with his Father, and is like him in the Qualities and Endowments of the Soul: *Non progenerat Aquila Columbam*; 'tis a Man only that begetteth a Man; 'tis a Man, not a Horſe or a Lion, can be the expreſs Image of the Perſon of a Man. Thus nothing can be the expreſs Image of Infinity, but what is infinite: And the Son of God, the eternal Son of an eternal Father, *God of God, Light of Light*, is the expreſs Image of his Father's Perſon: As he hath one and the ſame not ſpecifical, for the Divine Nature is indiviſible, and can be but one (ſince it is impoſſible there ſhould be more than one infinite moſt perfect Eſſence) but individual Divine Nature and Perfections. And ſo the Words, according to this Interpretation, amount to thus much, that he that ſeeth Chriſt who is the expreſs Image of his Father's Perſon, ſeeth him who cannot but be of the ſame Nature and Divine Eſſence: And ſo the Conſequence is yet more clear and evident, that Chriſt is one with the Father, that he is the moſt High God, the God of *Iſrael*.

The Words being thus cleared, if there were no other Place of Scripture to prove this great Truth, yet from this alone we have ſufficient Ground to believe it. But the Divinity of the Bleſſed Jeſus is almoſt in every

Para-

Paragraph, writ in ſuch large and evident Characters, that he that runs may read it: Would you ſee it written by a Sun-Beam? What can be more bright and illuſtrious, than that Saying of St. *Paul* to *Timothy*? 1 Tim. 3. 16. *Without Controverſy great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs: God was manifeſted in the Fleſh, juſtified in the Spirit, ſeen of Angels, preached to the Gentiles, believed on in the World, received up into Glory.* Here the word *God* is the Subject of ſix Propoſitions together, and therefore according to the Rule laid down by the Socinians, ſignifieth the ſupream Power and Majeſty, excluding all others from that Deity. Now that that Text is meant of our Saviour, and not of the Will of God revealed by frail mortal Man, and glorioufly received on Earth, as they would interpret the Place, is clear, without they make the Scripture ſpeak Contradictions; and ſo to be taken up into Glory, be to be received glorioufly on Earth; and then up is down; above, below; Earth, Heaven.

Beſides, it is the ſame Word which is uſed by the Septuagint for the Aſſumption of *Enoch* and *Elijah*, and in the New Teſtament for the Aſcenſion of our Saviour; *Mark* 16. 19. *Acts* 1. 2. *Acts* 1. 11, 22. Wherefore this being the conſtant Notion of the Word, we muſt either learn a Language which the Scriptures know not, and the Holy Ghoſt never uſe; or elſe according to their own Rule, Jeſus muſt be this moſt High God manifeſted in the Fleſh. Would you read this Doctrine engraven by the Point of a Diamond? Conſult St. *John*'s firſt Epiſtle, *chap.* 5. *ver.* 20. *We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an Underſtanding to know him that is true: and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jeſus Chriſt: This is he true God, and eternal Life.*

To

To this our Adverſaries object only, That there is a Poſſibility the laſt Words in Grammatical Conſtruction may be referred to the Father. But becauſe the Son is the immediate Antecedent, to which the Relative can properly be referred, 2. The Son is here chiefly treated on, which is the Rule they give for interpreting ſuch Places of Scripture. And, 3. ſince the Reaſon rendred, why we are in the true God, is, becauſe we are in the Son, *viz.* becauſe the Son is the true God. And, 4. in St. *John*, the conſtant Title of our Saviour is Eternal Life. Since, I ſay, all theſe Reaſons are in the Text it ſelf, why the Title of the true God ſhould be attributed to the Son, and not here referred to the Father, who indeed is ſpoken of in the Text but at a diſtance, I cannot but conclude that our Saviour is the True God, and Eternal Life, the moſt High God, the God of *Iſrael*.

If we look into the Old Teſtament, we ſhall find many Places which directly ſpeak of the God of *Iſrael*, which are interpreted by the Apoſtles in the New, to be meant of none but Chriſt. If *David* ſay, *The Iſraelites luſted in the Wilderneſs, and tempted God in the Deſart*; and *Moſes* deſcribes the Hiſtory thereof, *Numb.* 21. 5, 6. and tells us, *God ſent fiery Serpents to deſtroy them*: St. *Paul* will tell us, *this God was Chriſt*; 1 Cor. 10. 9. *Neither let us tempt Chriſt, as ſome of them alſo tempted, and were deſtroyed of fiery Serpents.* What indeed would theſe Men have, if we muſt not believe ſuch Places and palpable Truths as theſe are? Will they make both us and themſelves Idolaters? And yet they do no otherwiſe, who give the Honour and Worſhip to the Creature, which is due only to the Creator: for (beſides that God ſaith, he will not give his Honour to another) what I pray you is Religious Worſhip, but

that Homage, Faith and Obedience, which ought to be paid, and is really due from the Creature to the great Creator? Now as it is impoſſible that God can be otherwiſe than the firſt Cauſe and Creator of all things, and ſo cannot deveſt himſelf of that Soveraignty which he hath over the Creature; ſo it is equally impoſſible that another ſhould have the ſame Homage, Honour and Religious Worſhip with the moſt High God, without Idolatry, (and yet we are bound to honour the Son as we honour the Father) unleſs he be likewiſe the firſt Cauſe, the great Creator; which for a Creature to be, implies a Contradiction. Since then the Reaſon of the Law, *viz.* our Obligation to worſhip God upon the Account of Creation, always continues; why not the Law it ſelf, which commands, *Thou ſhalt worſhip God alone, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve?* If they ſay their Worſhip of Chriſt is ſubordinate, and directed through Chriſt to God the Father; why then do they call the Romaniſts Idolaters? Why do they not ſhake Hands with *Bellarmine*, and kiſs the Pope's Toe, who allows no other Worſhip to the Virgin *Mary*, and the reſt of the Saints, than they do to Chriſt, whom they make altogether a Creature? Neither will their Simily of a King and his Son, or a Favourite, do here; for a King may deveſt himſelf of his Royal Authority: but it is otherwiſe with God, he cannot but be the firſt Cauſe of all things, and therefore the Creature will be always bound to worſhip him as ſuch. Now as it's contrary to the Juſtice and Truth of God to command us to worſhip him for the firſt Cauſe, for the Creator, who is but a mere Creature: So ſince we are obliged by Scripture to pay the ſame Homage, Faith and Obedience to the Son as to the Father, to honour the Son as we honour the Father; we muſt conclude that the

Son,

Son, as well as the Father, is the firſt Cauſe, the great Creator, the moſt High God, the God of *Iſrael*.

But I will not ſtand any longer to prove the Sun gives Light. Our Saviour himſelf who is ὁ λόγος, the higheſt Reaſon, proves the Truth of this Doctrine in this very Goſpel appointed for this Day, in the Verſes immediately following the Text; from the In-dwelling of the Father and the Son: the Greeks call it περιχώρησις; the Latines, *Circumincеſſio*; but I know not well how to render it. Our Saviour ſaith, *Becauſe I am in the Father, and the Father in me*; which is fully expreſſed by the Apoſtle; *For in him*, ſaith he, *dwells the Fulneſs of the Godhead bodily*.

The ſecond Argument is drawn from his Words or Doctrine: *The Words*, ſaith he, *that I ſpeak, I ſpeak not of my ſelf, but the Father that dwelleth in me*. The Prophets of old ſpake as they were moved and directed by God; but here it is God himſelf that ſpeaks. *God who at ſundry times and in divers Manners ſpake in time paſt unto the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in theſe laſt Days*, ſaith the Divine Author to the *Hebrews*, *ſpoken unto us by his Son*, his natural Son: The Word being here taken emphatically, as appears by the Oppoſition here made to the Prophets, who are in Scripture-Language ſtiled the Children or Sons of God. Never Man ſpake as he ſpake, by his Adverſaries own Confeſſion; *Vox non hominem ſonat, eſt Deus certè*: What was blaſphemouſly aſcribed to *Herod*, is moſt certainly true; here *it is the Voice of God, and not of Man*.

The third Argument is taken from his Works and Miracles; *He, the Father*, ſaith Chriſt, *doth the Works, believe me*; ver. 11. *For the very Works ſake they declare my infinite Vertue, and demonſtrate my Omnipotency*. The ruffling and roaring Winds, the boiſterous Waves

obey his Voice, and the Seas acknowledg the Lord High Admiral of the Ocean, to be aboard: The Fish bring Silver in their Mouths to do Homage, and pay their Quit-Rents to their supream Lord and Maker: The Loaves and Fishes multiply, as receiving another Nature from the God of Nature, and the Author of all Fecundity: Diseases fly, and the Devils tremble at his Command, and are forced to confess, what the Socinians deny, that Jesus is the Holy One, the most High God, the God of *Israel*.

Neither will the Objection which they make from the 14*th* Verse of this Chapter, where Christ saith, *He that believeth on him, shall do greater Works than he doth*, signify any thing; for the Words answer themselves: It is by his Power and Authority they are done, by believing on him who is one in Essence with the Father; for *whosoever believeth on him, believeth on the Father*. Jesus saith unto him, *Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me*, Philip? *He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father*.

But, saith carnal Reason, this is an hard Saying, who can bear it? What *Hocus-Pocus* Tricks have we here to make two one, and one two? What Legerdemain Divinity? What religious Non-sense is this? Can the Father be the Son, and the Son the Father? If the Son have the same Essence with the Father, how then can they differ? Can any thing differ from its own Essence? Can it differ from its self? Sure these are the Dreams of some superstitious Zealots, whose Devotion makes them with the Athenians, build Altars, ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ, *to the Unknown God*.

The most High God, who is the highest Reason, will not oblige his Creature to believe things contrary to Reason, and make us do Violence to our own natural Faculties.

The

The old Jews thought not of ſuch a Plurality of Perſons in one Divine Eſſence; the Old Teſtament no where mentioneth it: And if we conſult the New, we ſhall find Chriſt's Divinity to be by Donation, not by Eternal Generation; that God highly exalted him, and gave him a Name above every Name: but this was the Reward of an excellent Vertue, of an incomparable Submiſſion to the Death of the Croſs, and an unerring Obedience; nothing here of an Exiſtence and Divinity before he was born of the Virgin. 'Tis true indeed, he might be called the Son of God, becauſe the Virgin was over-ſhadowed by the Power of the moſt High; but who ever dream'd, the Antient of Days was con-infantiated, and entred into the Womb of a Woman? If this be true, how could the Father be greater than he? Can any thing be greater than it ſelf? Why doth Chriſt acknowledg that all the Power he hath, was given him of the Father; that he can do nothing of himſelf; that he came not of himſelf, nor to do his own Will, or to ſeek his own Glory? If he be the moſt High God, how comes it to paſs that he is not omniſcient, that he knows not the Day of Judgment, that he cannot diſpoſe of Places in Heaven, that he denies himſelf to be good, that he affirms the Father to be the only true God? How is it, that he received Commands from God, to be ſent into the World? What makes him to pray? What, did he put up his Petitions to himſelf? If he be God, how could he die, and be raiſed again by the Power of his Father? And laſtly, why doth he give this as the only Reaſon why he is ſaid to be the Son of God, becauſe he was ſanctified by the Father, and ſent into the World? Thus you ſee theſe *Zamzummims* of Reaſon would deſpoil the ὁ λόγος, the higheſt Reaſon of his Divinity. But

as

as *Eliſha* ſaid to his Servant, *There be more with us than with them*; and if that one, who is more than all, be for us; if the *Chariot and Horſemen of Iſrael* be on our ſide, let *Socinus* and his Followers do what they can, I doubt not but we ſhall prevail againſt them.

The time allotted for this Exerciſe, will not give me leave to anſwer diſtinctly to every one of theſe Arguments. I will therefore reduce them ſummarily into Heads and Claſſes; and by applying an Anſwer to each Head, let you ſee eaſily how you may give a diſtinct Solution to every Argument in particular.

Firſt then, ſaith the Objector, it is againſt Reaſon. To this I anſwer, That it may be above Reaſon, as to the manner of explaining it; but that it is contrary to right Reaſon, I deny; for Reaſon, that Divine Candle of the Lord, hath diſcovered the neceſſity of this Doctrine to her chiefeſt Adorers. To paſs by *Triſmegiſtus* and others, whoſe Writings are ſuſpected; what made *Plato* in his fourth Book of Laws, ſay, that God ſhould be the Rule and Meaſure of all things, principally if any where he took upon him the Nature of a Man? Why did *Ariſtotle* ſay, it was neceſſary the Gods immortal ſhould veſt themſelves with Humanity, to deſtroy the Errors were crept into the World? *Tully* ſaith, The time will come, when there ſhall be but one common Lord and Maſter, God himſelf, who ſhall reign upon the Earth. Beſides, the Platoniſts plainly aſſert in their Writings, that there are three Hypoſtaſes or Perſons in the Deity. Either theſe Men found out this by the Light of Nature, and then how can it be contrary to Reaſon? or elſe they had it by Tradition from the Jews, and then it ſeems the old Jews underſtood it. And certainly it is the Doctrine of the Old Teſtament as well as the New.

But

But Reaſon ſhews the neceſſity of this Doctrine from one of her firſt Maxims or Principles: Every Good, ſaith ſhe, the more communicative it is, the better it is: if God then be infinitely good, he muſt be infinitely communicable, which can no otherwiſe be, but by Communication of the Divine Eſſence, which is only infinitely good: ſince the Creatures neither ſeparately nor conjunctly, can any way be ſaid to be ſo. Thus Reaſon ſpeaks a neceſſity of this Doctrine. Are not the Communicator and the Communicated diſtinct Perſons? Yet there can be but one individual, though communicable Divine Eſſence, ſince there can be but one infinitely Good and Perfect, as Reaſon dictates, and we all confeſs.

But to this they object, That the Son, as infinitely Good, muſt alſo be infinitely Communicable, and ſo *in infinitum*. To this I anſwer, That the Act of Generation or Communication, is infinite and eternal, and the Eſſence communicated is infinite; how then can there be more than one infinite and eternal Act of Generation? Where ſhall ye next begin, ſince this can never be at an end? But if you urge the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt; I anſwer, That every thing which is begotten proceedeth; but not every thing that proceedeth is begotten. *Eve* was produced and came forth of *Adam*, and yet was not generated by him: So the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt cannot prejudice the eternal Generation of the ſame. For though the Eſſence be the ſame which is communicated from the Father to the Son, and from the Father and Son to the Holy Ghoſt; yet there is a difference in the Communication, the Word being God by Generation, the Holy Ghoſt by Proceſſion. So that though there cannot be more than one infinite and eternal Act *in ſuo genere*, in its kind, by way of

of Underſtanding, which in ſpiritual Beings is Conception or Generation; ſo it's no contradiction, that there be an infinite Act of the Will too, by way of infinite Love or Volition, which is Proceſſion.

But, ſaith the Objector, if it be neceſſary that an infinite Good be infinitely communicable, how can theſe two be one? as it is indeed the uſual Method of our Adverſaries to poſe us with the manner of the Exiſtence of a Plurality of Perſons in one Divine Eſſence. But who knows not, that as to argue from the Exiſtence to the manner of exiſting, is no Conſequence? ſo to argue we know not the manner of it, therefore it is not, is very bad Logick. We know not how the Loadſtone drills and draws the Iron into its cloſe Embraces, but we are ſure it is ſo. The Wind we know blows; but whence it comes, and whither it goes, we are ignorant. In theſe, and a thouſand things more, is Reaſon poſ'd in Naturals, much more in Supernaturals: So that it is a ſufficient Anſwer to ſay, Scripture and Reaſon tell us it is ſo; but how it is ſo, we know not: Neither do we deſire to know, leſt with the *Bethlemites* we ſmart for our peeping into the Ark of the Lord. But we are not altogether in the dark as to this neither: There is ſomething in Nature, (which tho there be no proportion between finite and infinite) may yet at the leaſt ſhadow out ſomething not altogether unlike this Plurality of Perſons in one Eſſence. If we lift up our Eyes towards Heaven, and look upon the Sun, we cannot but perceive ſome Glimmerings of this great Truth in that beautiful and glorious Body: Is it not the Fountain and Cauſe of natural Light? Was it ever deſtitute of this pleaſing Act of Generation? Did it not, ever ſince it was a Sun, ſend forth theſe bright and joyful Emanations? Thus the Son of God

is

is the Brightneſs of his Father's Glory, the eternal Son of an eternal Father. Are not the Sun and its darling Light diſtinct Suppoſites? Do they not differ as Cauſe and Effect, Begetter and Begotten? It is a poor ſhift here to ſay, that Light is a Quality; for Reaſon in the beſt of Antients, *Democritus*, *Epicurus*, and generally in all the modern Philoſophers, ſpeaks the contrary. In ſhort, the Sun naturally and neceſſarily produceth Light. Thus God, who is the moſt free Agent in this great Act of Generation, acts *ex neceſſitate Naturæ*, naturally, which is the higheſt Perfection, as I ſaid before; becauſe being infinitely Good he is infinitely Communicable. Now that the Sun and Light, which, as Cauſe and Effect, Begetter and Begotten, have one and the ſame individual Eſſence, appears from the tacit Conſent of all Men I ever met with: for if nothing interpoſeth between the Rays of the Sun and them, they will ſay, they are in the Sun: And it is true, for the Sun is Light, and Light is the Sun; they are one in Eſſence, tho diſtinct as Cauſe and Effect. I could enlarge much upon this Similitude, and make it clearer than the Sun it ſelf. But Time calls me to anſwer their other way of arguing, which is by Scripture, wherein I will be as conciſe as may be, for I fear I have already tired your Patience.

Firſt, ſay our Adverſaries, his Divinity was by Donation, as appears from *Phil.* 2. 9. And again, the Father is called the Head, nay the God of Chriſt.

I anſwer; All this is in reſpect of his humane Nature, as we may ſee in the Chapter cited, *Phil.* 2. for he that was in the Form of God, and thought it no Robbery to be equal with God, took upon him the Form of a Servant, ſubmitting to the Death of the Croſs, the Puniſhment of Slaves and Servants. The

Exaltation therefore of the Humane Nature, as a Reward of his Death and Suffering, could be no prejudice to his Divinity, which the Apoſtle aſſerts fully in the foregoing Verſes.

But, ſaith the Objector, how can the Son be the Father? To do nothing of himſelf, not to come of himſelf, or ſeek his own Glory, are Imperfections not ſuitable to the Divine Nature. I anſwer; What he calls Imperfections, are the greateſt Perfections: for ſince the Divine Nature can be but one Chriſt, if he be the proper natural Son of God, as he is ſaid to be in Scripture, muſt have the ſame individual Eſſence with the Father, and ſo conſequently, what the Jews affirmed for Blaſphemy, the moſt High God: and he doth nothing of himſelf, becauſe the Father that dwelleth in him, worketh together with him. *Opera Dei ad extra ſunt indiviſa.*

The third ſort of Objections are from thoſe Scriptures which deny ſome Perfections to belong to Chriſt, in ſome certain Reſpect: But our Adverſaries deny them abſolutely, as not to know the Day of Judgment, and the like.

The fourth Objection is, when they attribute ſome Imperfection to Chriſt abſolutely, which is ſpoken of him in Scripture only in ſome certain Reſpect, as to be Man, to Die, to Pray, to be Raiſed again; that the Father is greater than he, and the like; all which are ſaid of him only in reſpect of his Humanity.

Laſtly, ſaith the Objector, Chriſt gives this as the only Reaſon why he is ſaid to be God, becauſe he was ſanctified, and ſent into the World. And here I beg your leave to be more copious; and that I may not ſeem to derogate, or take any thing from the ſtrength of the Argument, I will repeat the very Words of their Authors,

thors, as they are ſet down in the Racovian Catechiſm, *pag.* 19. Having premiſed, that the word *God* is taken two ways in Scripture; firſt, for the moſt High; ſecondly, for him who hath ſome ſublime Dominion under him; they add, that in the latter Signification, the Word of God is in certain Places dignified with the Title of God. And this we prove, ſaith the Racovian Catechiſm, from the very Words of the Son himſelf, John 10. 35. *If ye call them Gods to whom the Word of God comes, and the Scripture cannot be broken: Say ye of him whom the Father hath ſanctified, and ſent into the World, Thou blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſaid I am the Son of God?* By this Speech Chriſt doth clearly intimate both that the word *God* is ſometimes attributed in Scripture to them who are far inferiour to that one God; as alſo that he called himſelf the Son of God for no other reaſon, than becauſe he had been ſanctified by the Father, and ſent into the World.

To this I anſwer, 1*ſt*, That I admit the diſtinction; but that the word *God* is applied to Chriſt only, in the latter Signification, is falſe, as I have before proved: And to ſay only, as they do, that in certain Places of Scripture, the Word, when attributed to Chriſt, is taken, in the latter Signification, for him that hath ſome derivative Power from the moſt High God, makes nothing againſt us: for in certain other Places of Scripture it is attributed to Chriſt, in the former Signification, for the God of Gods, or the moſt High God. If indeed they had ſaid, that in every Place of Scripture, where the word *God* is applied to Chriſt, it is taken only for him who is inferiour to the Supream God, they had ſpoke to the purpoſe. And if this be their

Meaning, which I think it is, yet what they offer for Proof, is altogether illogical and non-cogent: For who that ever pretended to Reason, ever went about to prove an universal Affirmative by one Particular? and yet they do no otherwise here, for thus they argue; Christ calls himself the Son of God, and so consequently a God in one Place of Scripture, *viz. John* 10. 36. wherein the word *God* is used in the latter Signification for him that hath some derivative Power from the most High God, and for no greater reason, than because he is sanctified, and sent into the World; therefore in every Place of Scripture, where the word *God* is ascribed to Christ, it must be so taken, and for the same reason. Now help me Logick, if this be found Reasoning, and good Argumentation? The King of *England* is called and acknowledged King of *France* by us here in *England*, therefore he is so in *France*, *Spain*, *Italy*, and all the World over. Who is so dimsighted, as not to perceive this egregious *non-sequitur*? But suppose, what cannot be granted, that he called himself God for that reason, yet it is not expressed, that he calls himself so for no greater; he might declare this, and conceal others at this time, when the Jews were about to stone him, for ought our Adversaries can say to the contrary. Nay, what if he doth not at all alledg this Reason for his calling of himself God? which indeed he doth not, as will appear from the consideration of the Context. The Jews, *ver.* 34. accuse him of Blasphemy, and because, *thou being a Man, makest thy self a God.* Our Saviour answers to this Accusation, *The Scripture calls them Gods to whom the Word of God came*; therefore if I am sanctified or set apart by the Father, and sent into the

World

World to preach this Word, I am no Blaſphemer, though I call my ſelf God. It is one thing to ſay, I call my ſelf God, becauſe the Father hath ſanctified me and ſent me into the World; and another to ſay, If I call my ſelf God, for that Reaſon I am no Blaſphemer: for Chriſt doth not here go about to ſhew how he is ſaid to be God; but to anſwer their Accuſation, and prove that he was no Blaſphemer, becauſe he ſaid he was the Son of God. So that the Senſe of the Words is clearly this, I am no Blaſphemer by calling my ſelf God, ſince being ſanctified by the Father, I ſpake nothing contrary to Scripture, which calls them Gods to whom the Word of God came.

And now I hope I have brought to the ground this high and mighty Objection, having ſhewn firſt, that the word *God* (which is ſuppoſed, not granted) be attributed to Chriſt in the latter Signification, for him that hath ſome derivative Power from the moſt High God; yet in certain other Places of Scripture (when attributed to him) it is taken for the God of Gods, or the moſt High God.

2*dly*, If they mean (what is falſe) that in every Place of Scripture where the word *God* is given to our Saviour, it is taken only for him, who hath ſome derivative Power from the moſt High God; yet their Argument is not good, becauſe it concludes from one ſole Particular, an univerſal Affirmative.

3*dly*, Becauſe if he does give his Sanctification and Miſſion as a Reaſon of his Deity; yet it cannot be ſaid he called himſelf God for no greater Reaſon, ſince it is not

not ſo expreſſed in the Text, and he might declare this, and conceal others at this time, when the Jews were about to ſtone him, *His Hour*, as he ſaith elſe-where, *being not then come.*

4*thly*, and laſtly; He doth not ſay, he calls himſelf God for that Reaſon, but ſaith only that if he call himſelf God, for that Reaſon, he is no Blaſphemer; his Deſign being not to ſhew how he was God, but to prove he was no Blaſphemer. So that I think now we may ſafely enough conclude, that *he that ſees the Son, ſeeth the Father*; that Jeſus is one in Eſſence with the Father, that *he is the moſt High God, the God of* Iſrael.

There are yet two Difficulties, the Independency of Chriſt, and the Union of the Divine and Humane Nature; both which I will briefly ſpeak to, and ſo conclude.

Firſt then, ſay the Socinians, Chriſt is ſaid in Scripture to be the Son of God, and therefore (ſince the Divine Eſſence, which is infinite and moſt perfect, cannot be multiplied without a Contradiction) Chriſt depends on the Father as to his Eſſence, which is an Imperfection not ſuitable to the moſt High God. In ſhort, ſay they, Chriſt is dependent, therefore not the moſt High God.

To this I anſwer, 1. That nothing can be ſaid to depend upon another as to his Eſſence, but what is in time after that which cauſeth it; 2. That hath an Eſſence individually diſtinct from it; 3. Which is contingent

tingent as to its Eſſence, or is in the Power of another to be, or not be. But nothing of this can be ſaid of Chriſt; for the Father and the Son are co-eternal, nei-before or after other; the Son hath not an Eſſence diſtinct from the Father; neither is the Son of God contingent as to his Eſſence: It is not in the Power of the Father, that he be, or not be, ſince the Father naturally and neceſſarily begetteth the Son. In a word, they have both the ſame Eſſence, and how the ſame can be ſaid to depend upon it ſelf, is a manner of ſpeaking I am not acquainted with, and know not how to apprehend. Chriſt ſaith, *Rev.* 1. *I am the firſt and the laſt*; which Elogy the God of *Iſrael*, the moſt High God, appropriates to himſelf, *Iſa.* 48. 12. Now I would fain know how the firſt Being can be ſaid to depend upon another for its Being. If our Adverſaries ſay, as they do, that theſe Words are not to be underſtood abſolutely, but in reference to the Goſpel or Way of Salvation; then they contradict their own Principles, and take away the Difference between the firſt and ſecond Cauſe. They make the Son the firſt Cauſe, and yet they ſay the Father is the firſt or prime Author of Salvation; and ſo in reference to Salvation there is a firſt before a firſt, which implies a Contradiction. I conclude therefore, that theſe words are to be underſtood of Chriſt abſolutely, *viz.* that he is the firſt, being the Cauſe of all things, that *he is Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and End, the firſt and the laſt*; which denotes not only his Eternity, but likewiſe his Independency; For how can that which is before all things, be ſaid to depend on any thing?

As to the Union of the Divine and Humane Nature into

into one Perſon, our Adverſaries thus argue; It's impoſſible, that two endued with oppoſite Properties, ſhould combine into one Perſon: Or, that two Natures, each whereof is apt to conſtitute a ſeveral Perſon, ſhould be united into one Perſon.

I anſwer, Firſt, that is neither ſtrange, impoſſible, nor, as our Adverſaries ſay, repugnant to ſound Reaſon, that two Subſtances, endued with oppoſite Properties, ſhould combine into one Perſon: for the Soul is immortal, and the Body mortal; yet theſe do ſo combine that they conſtitute one Perſon. Again, the Soul is not only apt to conſtitute, but is really a Perſon, according to the Platoniſt, (if a Perſon be a ſingular Subſtance endued with Reaſon) before its Entrance into the Body; for if each Soul did ſubſiſt by it ſelf many thouſand Years before its Body, it could not be ſaid to be part of a Man before it was united to the Body. And therefore a Nature which is not only apt, but really conſtitutes a Perſon, may be united to another Nature, as that both ſhall conſtitute one Perſon. There is no Neceſſity therefore in the Hypoſtatical Union, that there ſhould be two Perſons, and ſo conſequently two Chriſts; for as the reaſonable Soul and Fleſh is one Man, ſo God and Man is one Chriſt.

And it is falſe, what our Adverſaries ſay, that the Similitude holds not, becauſe according to us Chriſt is both God and Man; but Soul and Body are ſo conjoined, that a Man is neither Soul nor Body, for he is both. Thus the Scripture, ſpeaking of Men and Women, ſays, *So many Souls were added to the Faith:* And the common Speech is thus, is there any Body, or there

is

is no Body, meaning none of Mankind in ſuch or ſuch a Place. But if they will not, the Platoniſts Pre-exiſtence of Souls, which I, as Anſwerer, am not obliged to prove, but they to diſprove; yet according to the common Opinion, that two Perſons cannot combine, there is no Fear there ſhould be two Perſons in Chriſt; for nothing can be ſaid to be a Perſon, (as your own Definition of a Perſon intimates by the word Individual) unleſs it actually exiſt: But the humane Nature of Chriſt never exiſted, but in the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity. It is true if the humane Nature had been individuated, and ſubſiſted of it ſelf, before it was united to the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity, there might have been ſome Shew of an Objection; but this they know is not admitted. How then can Chriſt be ſaid to be more than one Perſon, ſince the Son of Man ſubſiſts only in the Perſon of the Son of God? What hinders then that a Perſon may be ſo united to another Perſon, which if it ſhould ſubſiſt of it ſelf, would be a Perſon, that they both be one only Perſon, ſince the one ſubſiſts in the other, and hath no proper Subſiſtence of its own? But it will be ſufficient in ſhort to ſay, *Rem ſcimus, Modum neſcimus*; the thing we know, the manner we know not: And it is no good Conſequence, as I ſaid before, to argue, you know not the manner, you know not how the thing is, therefore it is not.

Let us therefore admire and adore that infinite Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God, which hath revealed ſo much of that great Myſtery to Mankind, which the Prophets foretold, and the Angels themſelves deſired to peep into, *viz. God manifeſted in the Fleſh*; whereby

he that ſees Chriſt, ſeeth the Father, ſees the inviſible God, and approacheth to that Light which is inacceſſible. Would you then ſee the Father? Is your Soul athirſt for the living God? Do you breath and pant after eternal Life? Why then do you any longer gaze and gape after Vanity? Look upon Jeſus, there is no ſeeing the Father, but by the Son: View him in his Word, view him in his Works; *in him dwelleth the Fulneſs of the Godhead bodily*: He only can ſhew you the Father; *He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life*; he only can give you the Ante-paſts of Eternity, and whilſt you are here upon Earth, make you touch Heaven with a Finger; And though now, as the Apoſtle ſaith, *you can ſee him but as through a Glaſs, darkly*; yet the time will come when you ſhall ſee him as he is, *Face to Face*, encircled with all his Rays of Glory. Again, would you ſee the Father? Doth the Horror of your Sins affright you, and the infinite Juſtice of an angry God terrify you? Have you been bitten by the fiery Serpent, and would you ſee the Bowels of Mercy, and the tender Compaſſions of a Father? Look upon Jeſus, view him on the Croſs; ſee how he ſtretcheth forth his Arms to receive thee. How can'ſt thou now chuſe but cry out with the Apoſtle, ὁ βυθὸς, *O the Depth, and Length and Breadth of the Love of God in Chriſt Jeſus!* Behold him bleeding, there's Balſam in his Blood. The Serpent upon the Pole of the Croſs can cure all the venemous Stings of Satan, that red Dragon, that fiery Serpent. Let not the infinite Juſtice of God any longer terrify you: He that ſeeth Jeſus, ſeeth alſo the Father of Mercies, the God of Comfort and all Conſolations. As there was infinite Puniſhment due, ſo there is an infinite Satisfaction made; for he that ſacrificed

crificed himſelf for us, was both God and Man. *By the Blood of God,* ſaith the Apoſtle, *we are redeemed*; and Jeſus is this God, for he is, as the Apoſtle ſpeaks, Rom. 9. 5. *over all, God bleſſed for evermore.* Amen.

To him therefore, with the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt, be aſcribed, as moſt due is, all Honour, Glory, Praiſe, Might, Majeſty and Dominion, both now and evermore. *Amen.*

Glory be to thee, O Lord.

FINIS.